DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 575 CS 509 323

AUTHOR Chesebro, James W.
TITLE The Scholarly Imperative: Fusing Teaching, Research, and Service.
PUB DATE Mar 96
NOTE 16p.; Keynote address presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association (Memphis, TN, March 27-31, 1996).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Scholarship; *Speech Communication; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching; Dichotomies; Researcher Role; *Teaching Perspectives

ABSTRACT

A benchmark for conceptualizing the relationship between teaching, research, and service was provided 6 years ago by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The foundation maintained that the relationship between teaching, research and service was at present of benefit to no one, least of all the student. Therefore it put forth a model for the way in which scholarship should function--in short, as means of discovering, integrating, applying, and transmitting knowledge--but that model was, frankly, unimaginative and unpersuasive. A new model must be considered because, in truth, the survival of communication as a discipline depends on improved relationships between teaching, research, and service. To begin with, the influence of a number of external contexts must be considered: (1) the state legislatures' devaluation of research; (2) the new business-like approaches to university administration; and (3) the new attitudes regarding the student as customer or client. In the discipline of communication, service has been slighted; dichotomous thinking about teaching and research is pervasive. To transcend this thinking what the discipline needs to do is define itself in a way that intimately links teaching, research, and service as essential, mutually defining, and simultaneous dimensions of its scholarly enterprise. It needs to find a long-term learning orientation that brings together K-12 communication and college communication. Finally, the discipline needs to think of ways to transcend the research/teaching dichotomy. (TB)

The Scholarly Imperative: Fusing Teaching, Research, and Service

James W. Chesebro

Keynote Address Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association Convention, Saturday, March 30, 1996, in Memphis, Tennessee.

The immediate motive for this address was Nina-Jo Moore's convention theme, "Teaching Styles, Research Strategies, and Service Activities: An Eclectic View." For Nina-Jo, the term *eclectic* functions as her unifying theme.

However, from my perspective, I am interested in the equality the theme implies among teaching, research and service. At least, the theme allows for the possibility that teaching, research, and service could be treated as equally valued activities in the scholarly process.

The thesis I want to discuss today focuses on the equality among the three areas.

Towards this end, I want to do four things in this presentation.

First, I want to recognize a benchmark from which the relationships among teaching, research, and service can be examined.

Second, I want to isolate some of the contexts that now define the three areas. When we consider the situations we now face, I believe that how we articulate and forge the links among them will--literally--affect our survival in several ways.

Third, I want to describe the current status of the three areas in the discipline of communication.

Fourth and finally, I want to suggest some notions that may help us resolve how we link these three activities into a seamless and more productive definition of scholarship.

From this perspective, let me begin by identifying what I believe can be a useful benchmark for reconsidering how teaching, research, and service can and should be related. Hence,

Recognizing a Benchmark

For myself, a benchmark for conceptualizing teaching, research, and service was provided six years ago. My point of reference for understanding and measuring the relationships among the three areas was provided in 1990 by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.[1]

At that time, The Carnegie Foundation began its analysis on some rather depressing tones. Specifically, The Carnegie Foundation maintained that the current links or relationships among teaching, research, and service was of benefit to no one. Indeed, The Carnegie Foundation's constant frame of reference is that we are all "losers" if we continue to link the three areas as we have.

Accordingly, students first suffers. In the view of The Carnegie Foundation "students all too often are the losers." Students are led to believe "teaching is important" when--in fact--"teaching is not well rewarded." In a related fashion, "faculty who spend too much time counseling and advising students may diminish their prospects for tenure and promotion."

Moreover, concludes The Carnegie Foundation,"faculty are losing out, too." Some faculty are drawn to their "profession" because of their "love for teaching or for service."

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, all references to "The Carnegie Foundation" are derived from: Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

They become teachers to "make the world a better place." Yet, the campus climate "restricts creativity rather than sustains it."

In the view of The Carnegie Foundation, colleges and universities are also the losers. The campus is increasingly divided. Students are creating their own social units, and they perceive themselves as separate from the campus community. Students now believe that the campus has little to do with the understanding of their cultural identity and diversity in general.

Finally, The Carnegie Foundation has maintained that "the nation" is "losing." At a time when the larger society desperately requires the input of the academy in terms of its teaching, research, and service--according to The Carnegie Foundation--the academy has increasing lost its "connection" to the "social and environmental challenges" that confront the larger nation.

The Carnegie Foundation has sought to develop a benchmark that unifies teaching, research, and service, and intimately links these three areas into a more seamless process defining scholarship.

In this view, scholarship functions in four ways.

One function of scholarship is to discover knowledge. Discovering knowledge is a function often attributed to research.

The second function of scholarship is to integrate knowledge. Integrating knowledge is a function often attributed to interdisciplinary activities and programs.

The third function of scholarship is to apply knowledge. Applying knowledge is a function often associated to service.

And, a fourth function of scholarship is to transmit, transform and extend knowledge. The transmission, transformation, and extension of knowledge is a function often equated to and defining teaching.

In all, I find this conception to function as a benchmark for dealing with teaching, research, and service. In this view, the goal of education is scholarship, and scholarship seeks to discover, integrate, apply, and transmit knowledge. All four of these functions are interrelated, self-defining, and essential if scholarship is to exist. Because teaching, research, and service can each be equated to one of these scholarly functions, they must likewise must be understood as intimately related and self-defining processes.

While a benchmark, somehow The Carnegie Foundation's concept is not very persuasive. It fails to capture our imagination. It fails to encourage us to link teaching, research, and service. At the end of it all, we are somehow unsure of what action our discipline should undertake. Three years ago, in the *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, I formally maintained that The Carnegie Foundation's conception needs to be "adapted to each discipline." "In each discipline," specific "guidelines" might "well be needed to suggest how each of these four [scholarly] activities can and should function as equivalent forms of scholarship."[2] Thus, while The Carnegie Foundation provides a benchmark, it remains for us to determine how the conception will be implemented in the discipline of communication. "We are only at the inception

[2] James W. Chesebro, "Scholarship Reconsidered: Its Impact on the Communication Disciplines," *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration*, Numbers 3 and 4 (August/October 1993), p. 17.

of the process of dealing with the proposals" recommended by The Carnegie Foundation.[3]

From this perspective, let me consider the situations we currently face, and how those situations are forcing us to re-examining the current status among teaching, research, and service in some different ways. This brings me to my second point, the:

Contexts for Examining the Relationships Among

Teaching, Research, and Service

For the last several decades, we have discussed the relationships among the three areas as if the conversation was a purely academic exercise. We have perceived the discussion to be optional, hardly a matter of urgency, and as a series of analyses that might generate discretionary options we could consider. In this view, the resolution of the discussion could--but not necessarily will--affect our behavior in the academy.

I no longer believe that the relationships we establish among teaching, research, and service can be handled in this fashion. I am not trying to be alarmist, and I do not think I am overstating the case. But, I firmly believe that how we define the relationships among the three areas will--literally--affect our survival as a discipline, if several communication departments in the discipline will continue as viable units within the college and university system, and even if all of the individual faculty members in communication departments are needed.

In terms of context, what emphases should exist among teaching, research, and

[3] Chesebro, p. 18.

service? When we answer this question now, we are now aware that external accountability is critical, if not overwhelming. Three new contexts now exist that we cannot ignore, and these new contexts redefine the issues involved and how they are to be resolved.

One of these external contexts or audiences is the state legislature, a group increasingly demanding that more attention be given to teaching, and a group that is increasingly questioning the value of research. For state legislatures, the significance and power of research has not been demonstrated. State legislatures have not found long lists of published articles, long lists of convention papers, and long lists of published books compelling. State legislatures are "paying the bills," and they are careful about what they want to paying for. As many of our research and doctorate-granting communication departments are finding out--often the hard way--we need to be aware of state legislatures value teaching, research, and service.

A second external context is the university environment itself. We can no longer assume that a university holds research to be its most significant goal. University administrations are changing. Indeed, university administrators increasingly appear to function as business people, hoping to maximize the efficiency of the educational system, increasing faculty-student ratios, and increasing the number of classes faculty members teach. Let me share a personal perspective here. Indiana State University has a new President. However, the President is unlike any of the other Presidents of ISU who have moved from a traditional academic department, up the ranks, to the Office of the President. Instead, our new President obtained his Ph.D. degree in educational

administration, and his life goal and training have solely been devoted to becoming a university president.

When university administrations change in these ways, university goals also begin to operate in subtle ways. Last year, at ISU, for example, the University formulated a single goal for one year. Hence, the President proclaimed 1995 as the "Year of the Student." Who could argue? But, this slogan also created certain priorities, with other funding programs moving closer to the bottom of the list. Within such a framework, the teaching efficiency and quality of teaching in departments are compared, with rewards going to the departments that can demonstrate increases their teaching efficiency and effectiveness.

A third context is also equally important. Increasingly students are viewing themselves as our "clients" and our "customers." This business metaphor changes education. We may argue for the value of a liberal arts education. But, students want their education to increase their incomes when they leave the educational institution. And, some professional educational associations are actively promoting the notion of students as clients, if not customers. In terms of the immediate needs to students, teaching is understood to be far more important than research and service.

Given these three contexts, what is the current status of teaching, research, and service in the discipline of communication? There are no ready or easy descriptions of the relationships among these three areas in the discipline of communication. Yet, for our own survival, we need to consider more formally:

The Current Status of

Teaching, Research, and Service in the Discipline of Communication

In my view, all of the evidence I know points in one direction. It suggests that the discipline of communication has tended to slight service, and that it has polarized teaching and research.

Four brief examples illustrate my point.

First, research products have been categorized and dichotomies. Our journals reflect the distinctions we make. Accordingly, we have distinguished our "pedagogical" journal, *Communication Education*, from our "content" journals such as the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Communication Monographs*, and the *Journal of Applied Communication Research*.

From a broader perspective, some research falls under the head of "communication" because it is social scientific in its method and style. Other research reports are identified as "speech," "rhetoric," or humanistic in their approach and style. In this regard, Burgoon has aligned "communication" reports with "theory and research" and "research knowledge," while he has cast "speech" or "rhetoric" with an "entirely distinct discipline," discrete from "communication reports," that deals with "teaching" and "non-disciplinary" and "prescriptive material."

So, our research products have been affected by the teaching-research dichotomy.

Second, teaching itself has been affected by the research-teaching dichotomy. Some faculty view their classroom role in a research framework, and they believe that their task is to introduce students to and master the concepts and theories of the

discipline of communication. Other faculty view their classroom role in a pedagogical framework, and they believe their task is to adjust content material to the psychological needs of students. Wagener has maintained that these two conceptions of teaching are fast becoming the two major norms for distinguishing classroom activities and styles.[4]

So, teaching has been affected by the teaching-research dichotomy.

Third, in terms of tenure and promotion, the teaching-research dichotomy now distinguishes departments of communication. Consider the analysis provided by the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education. The Center compared Ph.D. institutions and two-year colleges in terms of two factors, (1) the relative importance they attribute to research, and (2) the relative importance attributed to teaching, when they grant tenure or promotion.

First, the Ph.D. institutions. At Ph.D. institutions, 73 percent view the "quality of research" as "very important," but only 16 percent view "teaching experience" to be "very important."

In sharp contrast, two-year colleges hold that teaching is important, not research. Hence, at two-year colleges, only 1 percent view the "quality of research" as "very important," while 56 percent view "teaching experience" to be "very important."[5]

In this sense, the research-teaching dichotomy now governs our tenure and promotion system.

---

[4] Ursula Wagener, "Affording Quality Teaching," *Policy Perspective, 2* (1989), p. 1.

[5] National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, *A Descriptive Report of Academic Departments in Higher Education Institutions* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, January 1990), pp. 23 and 28.

Fourth and finally, in terms of professional governance, we use the teaching-research dichotomy. With great love, let me "pick" on SCA for a moment. One of SCA's primary boards, on the Administrative Committee, is the Research Board. Another board, independent in functions and appointments, is the Educational Policies Board. Indeed, to illustrate how these two Boards divide the world up, in even numbered years, the Educational Policies Board sponsors SCA's Summer Conference. In other numbered years, the Research Board sponsors SCA's Summer Conference. Moreover, SCA's Divisions are "substantive" or content-oriented, while SCA's Sections are linked to the type of teaching institution at which one is employed. Accordingly, at SCA's annual convention, programs tend to have either a content or a teaching orientation. Likewise, in SCA, the word *scholarship* is predominantly, by most people, associated with researchers, not teachers. Our governance system reflects the teaching-research dichotomy. But, I am not trying to single out SCA or pick on SCA. I think SCA is merely a reflection of the discipline of communication.

In all, as I see it, major areas of the discipline of communication are now divided in terms of a research-teaching dichotomy. Yet, as I have earlier suggested, the contexts in which we now exist argue against the use of such a dichotomy. If we are to survive as a discipline that values and integrates teaching, research, and service, we need to reconsider how we have been doing things. Particularly, we need to devise systems for:

Resolving and Transcending the

Teaching, Research, and Service Distinctions

I want to suggest some notions that may help us resolve how we link these three

activities into a seamless and more productive definition of scholarship.

I have done this before, and outlined some seven specific suggestions for transcending the teaching-research dichotomy.[6] In this presentation, let me add three additions to that list.

First, we need to define *communication* so that teaching and research are intimately and inseparably related. In other words, we need to define communication in a way that intimately links teaching, research, and service as essential, mutually-defining, and simultaneous dimensions of its scholarly enterprise.

This goal is easier said than done. Dance and Larson have argued that there are 126 definitions of *communication* in the discipline.[7] Accordingly, if select one definition, our starting point is arbitrary. In terms of the scope of the discipline, any single definition we use will be limiting. Ultimately, we will probably have to pass through every one of our major conceptions of communication to reconsider and redefine its teaching, research, and service biases.

Yet, an example is required. Because of the near universal attention it has received, a classical perspective is a convenient point of departure that illustrates the redefinitional process involved. Thus, in terms of a speech, as Cicero cast it, we can define communication in terms of five canons of rhetoric: Invention; Organization; Style; Memory; and Delivery. These five parts represent, not only subdivisions, but also

---

[6] James W. Chesebro, "Unity and Division within the Discipline of Communication," *California Speech Communication Journal, 1* (Fall 1994), pp. 59-60.

[7] Frank E. X. Dance and Carl E. Larson, *The Functions of Human Communication: A Theoretical Approach* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), pp. 171-192.

"commonplaces" for understanding the communication process and the "resources" of a "speaker."[8]

With this conception in mind, we can begin to make some equations and links that align classical rhetoric and The Carnegie Foundation's conception of scholarship.

In this context, *invention* is a creative process used to find out what should be said. In this sense, invention bears a striking relationship to the discovery or research function of scholarship.

Organization is the arrangement of what has been discovered. In this context, organization bears a striking relationship to the transformational and extension functions of associated with teaching.

Likewise, *style* as well as *delivery* both deal with the selection of appropriate language to convey an idea and the selection of the appropriate techniques used to deliver the idea. In this sense, they are applied decisions, but they are also part of the transmission function associated with teaching.

Although only an example, these kinds of equations suggests that The Carnegie Foundation's conception of scholarship may have direct relevance to the discipline of communication. A classical conception of communication can be understood in terms of the interrelated functions of scholarship. When we make these equations between canons of rhetoric and scholarly functions, we are also fusing or linking teaching and research in one of our conceptions of communication. I am equally convinced that a

[8] This conception is derived from: Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (New York: Columbia University Press), p. 69-70.

similar set of equations merging teaching and research could be understood to govern symbolic conceptions of human communication.

From a larger perspective, we need to re-examine our various definitions of communication to make two determinations. First, we need to understand how our conception of communication warrants or justifies a scholarly investigation. Second, we need to understand how our conception of communication requires that we fuse and treat teaching, research, and service as seamless dimensions or functions of the communication process.

In this sense, to resolve and to transcend the teaching-research dichotomy, we first need to define or re-define communication in a way that intimately links teaching, research, and service as essential, mutually-defining, and simultaneous dimensions of its scholarly enterprise.

Second, in a more practical way, the teaching-research dichotomy might also be transcended if we redefine how long-term learning is institutionalized. We currently discuss the understanding and mastery of communication in terms of a kindergarten through 12th grade framework and then a distinct college undergraduate system. The K-12 framework is frequently justified and discussed in terms of teaching objectives. In contrast, the organization and language of the undergraduate college curriculum reflects the content areas of the discipline and its various research undertakings. In this sense, the K-12 curriculum possess a teaching emphasis, while the undergraduate college has a stronger research orientation. According, elements of the teaching-research distinction are again reinforced.

If we are to resolve and transcend such dichotomies, we need to begin to adopt a long-term learning orientation. Specifically we need to consider the implications of adopting a K-16 orientation. This new orientation would required that we reconsider traditional distinctions that have unconsciously reinforced the teaching-research dichotomy. Certainly, a K-16 framework would require that colleagues from all levels of the discipline of communication interact in ways that they never have. Perhaps it is time that we rethink, if not try to transcend, the categories we have traditionally used to classify members of the discipline as "teachers" or as "researchers."

Third and finally, I think we need to ask how we might resolve and transcend the teaching-research dichotomy at our conventions. Indeed, we might develop convention programs at the national, regional, and state levels that feature, on the same program, our best researcher and our best teacher in particular content areas. Listening to our best researcher and best teacher interact about their commonly shared content would be tremendously interesting. But, our best researcher and our best teacher in each area need to talk to each other. They need to find commonalities. They need to formulate frameworks that allow them to exchange the best research and pedagogical knowledges. Such discussions should transcend and integrate teaching-research knowledges. Ideally, these newly formulated teaching-research frameworks would ultimately function as ideal teaching/research models for the rest of us.

So, three ways to resolve and to transcend the teaching-research dichotomy. Let me draw to a:

Conclusion

I am grateful to Nina-Jo Moore for asking us to reconsider teaching, research, and service. I do think we are at a critical juncture. State legislatures, universities, and students are all asking that we reconsider the time and energy we devote to teaching, research, and service.

If we are committed to scholarship, we need to ask how teaching, research, and service can be related as parts of a more complete definition of the knowledge of the discipline of communication. We need to articulate how the essential features of human communication are intimately, powerfully, and inseparably linked to the transmission or teaching, discovery or research, and applied or service functions of knowledge.

If we are to provide a comprehensive understanding of human communication, and if we are to convey our understanding about human communication to others, then we need to transcend the teaching-research dichotomy and link each of our understandings into the discovery-transmission functions implied by teaching and research.

Our future is clear. As a discipline, we need to link our discoveries or research about human communication to the most effective transmission devices or teaching techniques for sharing these discoveries. Our discovery/research and transmission/teaching efforts must become seamless, a set of interrelated and mutually defining processes used to understand and to explain every communicative act.

Thank you.

CS509322

Would you like to put your paper in ERIC? Please send us a clean, dark copy!

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Paper presented at the 1996 SSCA Convention (Memphis) Keynote Speech "THE SCHOLARY IMPERATIVE: FUSING TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE"

Author(s): JAMES W. CHESEBRO

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: March 27-31, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) ***and*** paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but ***not*** in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: James W. Chesebro

Printed Name/Position/Title: JAMES W. CHESEBRO PROFESSOR

Organization/Address: DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY TERRE HAUTE, IN 47802

Telephone: (812) 237-3253

FAX: (812) 237-3217

E-Mail Address: CMCHESE@RUBY.INDSTATE.EDU

Date: 10-7-96

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions

ERIC/REC
2805 E. Tenth Street
Smith Research Center, 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

~~ERIC Processing and Reference Facility~~
~~1301 Piccard Drive, Suite 100~~
~~Rockville, Maryland 20850-4305~~

~~Telephone: 301-258-5500~~
~~FAX: 301-948-3695~~
~~Toll Free: 800-799-3742~~
~~e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov~~

(Rev. 9/96/96)